

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed April 9, 2004 and references cited therein have been reviewed. In an effort to place the above-identified patent application in allowable form, Applicants have canceled claims 3-6 and 22, amended claims 1, 2, 7-21, 23-44, 49, 50 and 55-61 and added new claim 64.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 7, 14, 16, 18, 19, 22 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art and in view of Ellis 5,439,386. Claims 3-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art and in view of Ellis '386 and Israel 4,466,610. Claim 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art and in view of Ellis '386 and Hermann 4,090,759. Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art and in view of Ellis '386 and Glover 3,824,526. Claims 13, 15, 17 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art and in view of Ellis '386, Hermann '759, Israel '610 and Glover '526. Finally, claims 23-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the admitted prior art and in view of Ellis '386, Hermann '759, Israel '610 and Glover '526.

The Examiner asserted that the admitted prior art disclosed every limitation in independent claims 1 and 21 except for the joining cavity arrangement. The Examiner then cited Ellis in combination with the admitted prior art. As an initial matter, Applicants submit that Ellis is non-analogous art, thus cannot support a rejection of any of the claims. Applicants also submit that Israel is non-analogous art, thus cannot support a rejection of any of the claims. MPEP 2141.01(a) sets forth the standard for analogous prior art for supporting a prima facie case of obviousness. Ellis and Israel are not in the field of Applicants' endeavor, namely a connector for welders. Ellis pertains to coaxial cables. These special cables are shielded cables for use in transmitting low voltage audio

visual signals. The connector is designed to provide a quick connect environmental seal. The coaxial cable includes a single central conductive wire that is used to transmit an RF signal. The wire is encircled in a dielectric material that provides shielding for the RF signal traveling through the wire. The signal that travels through the wire is a low current signal so as to not damage the shielding material about the wire. Applicants submit that coaxial cable connections have nothing to do with welder cables that are connected to a welder. The welder cable includes multiple connectors. The welder cable also typically includes a plurality of connectors that are used to convey a high current to a welding gun so as to generate an electric arc between an electrode and a workpiece during the formation of a welding bead. Coaxial cable is not used as welding cable nor can it be a substitute for welding cable. As such, Applicants submit that one skilled in the art of welding would not look to the art of coaxial cables for a solution to a problem related to welder cables.

Israel pertains to an exercise club. An exercise club has nothing to do with welders, much less welder cable connectors. Applicants submit that one skilled in the art of welding would not look to the art of exercise equipment for a solution to a problem related to welder cables.

Consequently, Ellis and Israel are non-analogous art. See *In re Oetiker*, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

Applicants submit that even if Ellis was combined with the admitted prior art, which would be improper as set forth above, such combination would still not support an obviousness rejection of claims 1 and 21. Claims 1 and 21, as amended, require that the welder cable coupler include a plurality of electrical connectors. Ellis discloses a single electrical connector. There is no teaching from Ellis or the prior art that a plurality of electrical connectors of a welder cable coupler can be electrically connected to a welder cable when the welder cable is partially received in the cable

connection sleeve and prior to the joining cavity engaging an outer thread of the cable connection sleeve. Claim 1, as amended, also requires that the welder cable coupler include a gripping member having a plurality of nodes that are symmetrically oriented and form a star-shaped configuration. Ellis nor any of the other cited references disclose, teach or suggest such a gripping member configuration. For at least the reasons set forth above, claims 1 and 21 and all the claims dependent therefrom are not obvious in view of the cited art of record.

Applicants also submit that the cited prior art does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations of several of the dependent claims. For instance, there is no disclosure or teaching in the art with respect to the thread orientation as set forth in claims 7 and 8. There is also no disclosure or teaching in the art with respect to the beveled surface designed as set forth in claims 9, 10, 34 and 35. There is further no disclosure or teaching in the art with respect to the electrical coupling cavity configuration as set forth in claims 11-13, 36 and 37. There is also no disclosure or teaching in the art with respect to the coupling sleeve moveable along a longitudinal axis of the coupling jacket and being limited in movement by a retention member as set forth in claims 16, 17, 40 and 41. There is further no disclosure or teaching in the art with respect to an anti-rotation member as set forth in claims 18-20, 42 and 43. There is also no disclosure or teaching in the art with respect to the coupling sleeve orientation as set forth in claims 25 and 26. There is further no disclosure or teaching in the art with respect to the configuration of the gripping member as set forth in claim 31. Applicant submits that these dependent claims are also not obvious in view of the cited art of record.

Applicants also submit that the rejection of claims 23-63 is not supported by the cited art of record for one or more of the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 1 and 21 and the claims dependent therefrom.

Applicants submit that the claims pending in the above-identified patent application are in allowable form and notice to such effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE

By: 

ROBERT V. VICKERS
Reg. No. 19,504
1100 Superior Avenue, 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2579
Telephone: (216) 861-5582
Facsimile: (216) 241-1666